

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/426,567	Applicant(s) BANKS ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin C. Harper	Art Unit 2666	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kevin C. Harper. (3) _____
 (2) Keith Lutsch (Reg. No. 31,851). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 07 May 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12,13,24,25 and 45.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In response to the office action mailed May 10, 2004, and in order to advance the prosecution of the application, applicant's representative agreed to cancel claims 12-13 to overcome the double patenting rejection and rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. Applicant's representative agreed to amend claims 25 and 45 to overcome claim objections for typographical errors. Applicant noted that claims 7-10 and 30 of co-pending application 10/059,753 have been canceled and that claim 31 relied on in the double patenting rejection does not apply to claims 24-25. Examiner agrees that claims 24-25 are not obvious modifications of claim 31 of the co-pending application because claim 31 does not limitations regarding definitions of configurations of a first fabric and a second fabric.